

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	Application No. 10/696,735	Applicant(s) EROL ET AL.	
	Examiner Andrew W. Johns	Art Unit 2624	

All Participants:

(1) Andrew W. Johns, primary examiner.

(2) Jason Lohr, applicant's representative.

Date of Interview: 29 September 2008

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____ .

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 1:30pm

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

3, 22, 23, 29, 40, 58, 59, 66, 77 and 90

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Andrew W. Johns/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2624

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner noted that a number of claims included terms that did not appear to have adequate antecedent support in the preceding claim language. Because the application was otherwise in condition for allowance, examiner proposed changing "the source document" at line 2 of claim 3, line 2 of claim 40 and lines 2-3 of claim 77 to read --the image file document--; changing "the captured image" at line 1 of claim 22, line 1 of claim 59 and lines 1-2 of claim 90 to read --the input image--; and changing "the source document" at line 2 of claim 29 and lines 2-3 of claim 66 to read --the symbolic presentation document--. Applicant's representative reviewed the proposed changes to the claim language and approved all the proposed changes. Applicant's representative also noted a typographical error in claim 23, where "recorded images documents" at lines 6-7 should read --recorded image documents--. Applicant's representative also noted that claim 58 was dependent from itself. Examiner suggested that it might properly depend from claim 57. Applicant's representative reviewed the claims and agreed. Finally, applicant's representative verified that the missing application SN in paragraph [0004] in the specification was 10/660,985 and the SN missing from paragraph [0005] was 10/661,052. Examiner will insert the as part of examiner's amendment to implement agreed upon changes to place application in condition for allowance..